

## REMARKS

This is a response under 37 CFR 1.116 to the Office Action mailed 04/25/2005 finally rejecting the claims in the case.

Claims 1 and 6 have been amended and the amendments are deemed fully supported by pages 4 and 5 of the specification and by the figures. The amendments are not deemed to add any new matter and no further searching by the PTO is deemed necessary. It is therefore requested that the amendments be entered

### **35 USC 112 – Claim Rejection**

The rejection of claims 1 and 3-5 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph has been deemed obviated by the amendment to section c) of claim 1 specifying that the organic-solvent based liquid is applied in a bead coating to the surface of the web. Claims 1 and 3-5 are deemed to satisfy the requirements of 35 USC 112 and it is therefore requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

### **35 USC 102 and 103 – Claim Rejections**


The rejection of claims 1,3,5,6,8, and 10 under 35 USC 102(a) or (e) as being anticipated by Quiel and the rejection of claims 4 and 9 under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Quiel are traversed and deemed obviated by the amendments to the claims. Claims 1 and 6 have been amended to more clearly define the invention by specifying that an organic solvent-based liquid coating composition is applied in a bead coating on the surface of the web and that no electric field is imposed between the coating hopper and the web. The claims in the case are clearly not anticipated by Quiel since there is no disclosure in Quiel of coating an organic solvent based composition onto the surface of a web, but rather Quiel only discloses the coating of aqueous gelatine emulsions. Additionally, independent claims 1 and 6 clearly define that there is no electric field imposed between the coating hopper and the web. In contrast, an electrostatic field is an essential element of the Quiel system. Thus, these are two claim elements not disclosed in Quiel and Quiel cannot be said to anticipate the claims since, in order to anticipate, a reference must disclose all of the elements of a claim. Claim 6 has been amended to specify that the bead coating hopper is dimensioned for delivering a organic solvent-based liquid bead coating to the web. This is a structural limitation not disclosed in Quiel. The examiner's inherency argument is believed to be obviated by the amended claims. It is

therefore requested that the 102 and 103 rejections be withdrawn and the claims in the case allowed.

**Conclusion**

It is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. It is therefore requested that the final rejection be withdrawn and this application passed to issuance,

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Paul A. Leipold", written over a horizontal line.

Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Registration No. 26,664

Paul A. Leipold/rgd  
Rochester, NY 14650  
Telephone: 585-722-5023  
Facsimile: 585-477-1148

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.